

REMARKS

Claims 8-26 remain in this application, while claims 1-7 were previously canceled. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 9 and 21-25 are amended above after consideration of the comments provided by the Examiner on page 2 of the Office Action. All claims of this application now comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Each of claims 10, 18, and 26 is rewritten above in the manner referred to on page 4 of the Office Action and should now be allowable. Claims 11, 16-17, 19-20, and 23-24 depend on claim 10 and should also be allowable.

Independent claim 8 is rejected, along with various dependent claims, as being anticipated by German publication 33 31 472 to Henkel et al. Reconsideration is requested. Claim 8 is amended above to incorporate limitations previously appearing in claim 10 but without unnecessarily limiting the marking to a shackle, eyelet, or hook. The Henkel et al. seat arrangement does not include a draw band having a marking which can be hung in a mounting only if the backrest of the arrangement is currently locked as claim 8 now recites, and the rejection based on the Henkel et al. publication should be withdrawn. Nothing relied on by the Examiner suggests modifying the seat arrangement forming the subject matter of the Henkel et al. publication so as to include a draw band having such a marking, moreover, and it is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is patentable over the Henkel et al. publication.

Independent claim 8 is also rejected, along with various dependent claims, as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,012,776 to Schneider et al.

Reconsideration of this rejection is also requested. The Schneider et al. bench seat also does not include a draw band having a marking which can be hung in a mounting only if the backrest of the arrangement is currently locked as claim 8 now recites, and nothing relied on by the Examiner suggests modifying the seat forming the subject matter of the Schneider et al. patent so as to include a draw band having such a marking. It follows, therefore, that claim 8 is also patentable over the Schneider et al. patent.


Claim 8 is now patentable, along with 10, 11, 16-20, 23, 24, and 26, for reasons discussed above. Claims 9, 12-15, 21, 22, and 25 depend on claim 8 and are patentable as well. All claims now in this application, therefore, are now patentable.

This application should now be in allowable condition. If there are any questions regarding this Reply or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an extension of time sufficient to effect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #095309.55319US).

Date: August 9, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Richard R. Diefendorf
Registration No. 32,390

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
RRD:rd